

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-18, and 21-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 11, 19, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice to their reintroduction herein or in a future continuation or divisional application.

Applicant notes the Examiner's indication that claims 2-4 and 6-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 2, 6, and 8 have been rewritten in independent form to recite features of claim 1, although claims 2, 6, and 8 do not recite the inner tube bellows and pleats formerly recited in claim 1. The amendments are supported by page 18, lines 14-16, and the drawings, which disclose embodiments in which the inner bellows does not include pleats, but at least one spherical joint. In view of this amendment, the definition of the gap in claims 2, 6, and 8 has been amended to omit pleats. Claims 2 and 8 also do not recite the language "the inner tube being fixed to one open end part of the outer bellows" formerly recited in claim 1. This deleted language is deemed generally redundant of the recitations in claims 2 and 8 of "the inner bellows being fixed to an exhaust gas inlet of the outer bellows." Other amendments to claims 2, 6, and 8 are non-substantive.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 2, and to address a non-substantive matter of form.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 2. The recitation of separate bellow pieces is supported in Figs. 1(d) and 2(d). Other amendments have been presented for the purpose of clarification.

Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 2, and address a formal matter.

Claim 17 has been amended for the purpose of clarification.

Claim 21 is supported in the original disclosure at page 14, line 28 to page 15, line 2 and Figures 1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 3(a), 3(b), 3(d), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), and 7(a).

Claim 22 is supported at page 26, lines 9-23, and Fig. 3(e).

Claims 23, 24 and 29 are identical to claim 10, but depend from claims 6, 8, and 9, respectively.

Claims 25 and 26 are identical to claim 12, but depend from claims 6 and 8, respectively.

Claims 27 and 28 are identical to claim 15, but depend from claims 6 and 8, respectively.

Claim 30 is identical to claim 14, but depends from claim 24.

Approval and entry of the above claim amendments and new claims are respectfully requested.

Applicant has also amended the specification above to remove reference to specific claims, and substitute alternative language, e.g., “first aspect” for “claim 1”, and so forth. Applicant respectfully requests approval and entry of these amendments.

Drawings

Applicant has submitted replacement sheets for Figures 8 and 9 herewith, designating each with a prior art legend. Applicant respectfully requests approval of these drawing changes and withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 has been objected to on the ground that the term “the engine” lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection, and directs the Examiner’s

attention to the preamble of claim 6. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.


Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,600,752 to Lopatinsky.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0548.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Taylor
Registration No. 39,045

Berenato, White & Stavish
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(301) 896-0600